



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/799,627

03/15/2004

Yuji Kawasaki

0756-7270

8404

31780

7590

03/18/2008

ERIC ROBINSON

PMB 955

21010 SOUTHBANK ST.

POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165

EXAMINER

EL-ZOOBI, MARIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/799,627	Applicant(s) KAWASAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner MARIA EL-ZOOBI	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8,9,11-16 and 1819 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 10,17,20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner also maintains the double patent rejection.
2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

For example, claims 1-22 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,484.

Application claims 4 and 7 and patented application claims 1 and 4 or 12 and 15 or 24 and 27 are drawn to the same invention, "personal computer/videophone".

These claims differ in scope in that application claims 4 and 7 are broader in scope than the patented application claims.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the patented claims by omitting some limitations so to obtain application claims 4 and 7 as claimed.

Art Unit: 2614

4. Allowance of application's claims 4 and 7 would result in an unjustified time-wise extension of the monopoly granted for the invention defined by patented application claims 1 and 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

a. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

b. (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Hogan (US Patent 5,657,246)

Regarding claim 1, Schindler discloses, a personal computer (Fig. 2A) comprising:

a micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 102);

a display unit operationally connected to the micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 28)

a speaker operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 30)

a microphone operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 26)

Wherein the speaker is provided on at least one side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 30; speakers are provided on both sides)

and wherein the microphone is provided on a lower side of the display unit (Fig. 2A; el. 26; the speaker is lower side of the display).

Regarding claim 2, Hogan discloses, the personal computer further comprising a keyboard (Fig. 2A, el. 34).

Regarding claim 3, Hogan discloses, the personal computer further comprising a memory (Fig. 9, el. 104).

Regarding claim 11, Hogan discloses, a workstation (Fig. 2A) comprising:

- a micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 102);

- a display unit operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 28)

- a speaker operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 30) and

- a microphone operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 26)

wherein the speaker is provided on at least one side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 30; speakers are provided on both sides)

and wherein the microphone is provided on a lower side of the display unit (Fig. 2A; el. 26; the speaker is lower side of the display).

Regarding claim 12, Hogan discloses, the workstation comprising a keyboard (Fig. 9, el. 34).

Regarding claim 13, Hogan discloses, the workstation comprising a memory (Fig. 9, el. 104).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-6 and 14-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (US Patent 5,657,246) in view of Bruno (US Patent 5,710,591).

Regarding claim 4, Hogan discloses, personal computer (Fig. 2A) comprising:

a micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 102);

a display unit operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 28)

a speaker operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 30)

a camera operationally connected to the micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 24)

a microphone operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 26)

wherein the speaker is provided on at least one side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 30)

wherein the camera is provided on an upper side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 24; Hogan does not explicitly showing that the camera is on the top of the computer in his figure, however it is well known in the art, that the camera 24 could be place on the table or on the top of the computer or on a base)

wherein the microphone is provided on a lower side of the display unit (Fig. 2A; el. 26; the speaker is lower side of the display).

Hogan does not explicitly showing that the camera is on the top of the computer in his figure.

Bruno is showing in his figure that the camera is provided on the top of the display (Fig. 1, el. 20a, 20b).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Hogan computer to have the camera on the top of the display, in order to get better picture of the person who is doing the video conference.

Regarding claim 5, Hogan in view of Bruno discloses, the personal computer comprising a keyboard (Hogan: Fig. 2A, el. 34).

Regarding claim 6, Hogan in view of Bruno discloses, the personal computer comprising a memory (Hogan: Fig. 9, el. 104).

Regarding claim 14, Hogan discloses, a workstation (Fig. 2A) comprising:

- a micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 102);

- a display unit operationally connected to the micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 28);

- a speaker operationally connected to the micro-processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 30)

- a camera operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 24)

- a microphone operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 9, el. 26)

- wherein the speaker is provided on at least one side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 30)

wherein the camera is provided on an upper side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 24; Hogan does not explicitly showing that the camera is on the top of the computer in his figure, however it is well known in the art, that the camera 24 could be place on the table or on the top of the computer or on a base)

wherein the microphone is provided on a lower side of the display unit (Fig. 2A; el. 26; the speaker is lower side of the display).

Hogan does not explicitly showing that the camera is on the top of the computer in his figure.

Bruno is showing in his figure that the camera is provided on the top of the display (Fig. 1, el. 20a, 20b).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Hogan computer to have the camera on the top of the display, in order to get better picture of the person who is doing the video conference.

Regarding claim 15, Hogan in view of Bruno discloses, the workstation comprising a keyboard (Fig. 2A, el. 34).

Regarding claim 16, Hogan in view of Bruno discloses, the workstation comprising a memory (Fig. 9, el. 104).

Art Unit: 2614

8. Claim s 8-9 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schindler (US Patent 5,675,390) in view of Hogan (US Patent 5,657,246).

Regarding claim 8, Schindler discloses, a personal computer (Fig.1, el. 118) comprising:

- a micro processing unit (Fig.3, el. 310)
- a display unit operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 1, el. 122);
- a speaker operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 3, el. 340 and 338);
- a memory operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 3, el. 314 and Fig. 5, el. 518);
- a multiplexer operationally connected to the memory (Fig. 5, el. 540);
- a microphone (Fig.15, el. 1512) operationally connected to the multiplexer (Fig.15, el.1524) through an A/D converter (Fig.15, el.1516)
- a camera (Fig.15, el. 1532) operationally connected to the multiplexer (Fig. 15, el. 1524) through a digital signal processor (Fig.15, el. 1536).

Schindler is silent about how he arranges the speaker, microphone and the camera in related to the display.

Hoang discloses, wherein the speaker is provided on at least one side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 30)

Art Unit: 2614

wherein the camera is provided on an upper side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 24; Hogan does not explicitly showing that the camera is on the top of the computer in his figure, however it is well known in the art, that the camera 24 could be place on the table or on the top of the computer or on a base; also look at claim3 rejection)

wherein the microphone is provided on a lower side of the display unit (Fig. 2A; el. 26; the speaker is lower side of the display).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler with Hogan teaching, in order to have the peripheral devices in more convenient arrangement for the user.

Regarding claim 9, Schindler in view of Hogan discloses the personal computer comprising a keyboard (Schindler: Fig. 10 and Hogan: Fig. 2A, el. 34).

Regarding claim 18, Schindler discloses, a workstation (Fig.1, el. 118) comprising:

- a micro processing unit (Fig.3, el. 310)

- a display unit operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 1, el. 122);

- a speaker operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 3,el. 340, 338);

- a memory operationally connected to the micro processing unit (Fig. 3,el. 314 and Fig. 5, el. 518);

- a multiplexer operationally connected to the memory (Fig. 5, el. 540);

- a microphone (Fig. 15, el. 1512) operationally connected to the multiplexer (Fig. 15, el. 1524) through an A/D converter (Fig. 15, el. 1516)

a camera (Fig. 15, el. 1532) operationally connected to the multiplexer (Fig. 15, el. 1524) through a digital signal processor (Fig. 15, el. 1536).

Schindler is silent about how he arranges the speaker, microphone and the camera in related to the display.

Hoang discloses, wherein the speaker is provided on at least one side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 30)

wherein the camera is provided on an upper side of the display unit (Fig. 2A, el. 24; Hogan does not explicitly showing that the camera is on the top of the computer in his figure, however it is well known in the art, that the camera 24 could be place on the table or on the top of the computer or on a base; also look at claim3 rejection)

wherein the microphone is provided on a lower side of the display unit (Fig. 2A; el. 26; the speaker is lower side of the display).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler with Hogan teaching, in order to have the peripheral devices in more convenient arrangement for the user.

Regarding claim 19, Schindler in view of Hogan discloses, the workstation comprising a keyboard (Fig. 10).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 10, 17 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

Art Unit: 2614

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the Applicant provides a Terminal Disclaimer for each double patent rejection as set forth in the office action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARIA EL-ZOOBI whose telephone number is (571)270-3434. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8AM-5 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fan Tsang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Application/Control Number: 10/799,627

Page 13

Art Unit: 2614

/M. E./

Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Maria El zoobi/

Examiner, Art Unit 2614